

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Vol. XII, No. 7

Saturday, February 12, 1955

Washington, D. C.

Reactions to Moscow Shift: American errors in diplomacy contributed, in large part, to the rise of a new and tougher czar — according to the thesis of some observers here. These experts — after several days of study of the whole situation — come up with the following recapitulation of blunders:

(1) The sellout in Korea, when we did not even make — by negotiation — the best of a bad bargain. This gave an impression that we wanted “peace at any price.”

(2) The diplomatic defeat at the Geneva Conference over Indochina. This gave further “face” to Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

(3) “Operation Bended Knee” — the humiliating spectacle of Hammarskjold’s almost servile visit to Peiping, when he petitioned the Red masters for release of our 11 fliers.

(4) Eisenhower’s forthright unilateral stand on defending Formosa failed to provide a clearcut profile of American firmness, since it was impaired by the President’s support for what is now considered the worse than futile cease-fire effort of the UN.

(5) Behind-the-scenes talk of appeasement, which gave an impression of eventual readiness to compromise. Thus, Dulles, reportedly in talks with foreign journalists, gave the latter reason to think we regarded Quemoy and Matsu as purely bargaining counters. Actually — this column learns from high quarters — we have made a hard and fast decision to defend these key islands.

All in all — runs the summation — here is a picture of vacillation on the part of Washington that could well have encouraged the gangster elite in the Kremlin to choose a bolder leader than before.

● Dopesters here confirm that there is plenty of trouble going on within Russia, among the people, the bureaucracy and especially in agriculture. That explains the necessity for the “musical chairs” game — Khrushchev for Malenkov. They minimize the Russian Army leadership — like Zhukov — as a potential factor for peace. “A lot of wishful thinking by American headline-writers,” is the comment. Khrushchev, these dopesters believe, is the boss and might turn out to be another leader of the stature and strength of Stalin. He’ll be tougher in foreign policy and will back the Red China crowd.

● The “quadrille of the gangsters” in Moscow will encourage hopes in the satellite countries of Eastern Europe — Poland, Hungary, Roumania and East Germany — that “trouble among the masters” will lead to “freedom for the slaves.” This view is held by experts on the history and character of those countries who believe that a strong official stand by the U.S. government — say, by backing a congressional resolution to repudiate Yalta — would heat up the furnace of rebelliousness in these areas. Unfortunately, the Eisenhower regime has so far shown every sign of condoning the Yalta sellout.

● A story is going the rounds of the Capital, to the effect that General Douglas MacArthur did not give the speech he originally wrote for the Los Angeles birthday celebration on January 26. Initially, he had composed — it is claimed — an address strongly critical of the Far Eastern policy of the Eisenhower regime. Then five days before MacArthur was scheduled to speak in Los Angeles, President Eisenhower surprised everyone, including MacArthur, by taking a strong stand for the defense of Formosa. Hence, at the last moment, MacArthur had to produce another speech, devoid of a direct challenge to Administration policy — and this he did deliver. For, the “General in the Waldorf” did not wish to envenom the congressional debate on Eisenhower’s request for full powers to defend Formosa.

As to the accuracy of the story — some of MacArthur's friends firmly believe it, others deny it. But, it is symptomatic of lingering skepticism here about Administration policy that such a story is subject to discussion. Some who talk of it, wonder if the White House — learning in advance of the polemic nature of the original draft of the MacArthur speech — urged the President to "block the kick" by his Formosa stand. As reported in this column on January 29, the President unaccountably changed his attitude on Formosa within four days before the final decision on January 21 to stand fast. One question: if Ike had changed earlier, would Khrushchev have taken over?

Blunders and Baloney: Representative Lawrence Smith, key member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, exclaimed "scandalous" about an A.P. dispatch from Belgrade (February 7) which said that the U.S., Britain and France had formally agreed to give Yugoslavia about \$89 million in economic aid. The lion's share, or \$80 million, it was stated will come from the U.S., the rest from Britain and France. This — says the dispatch — will bring all aid, military and economic, to Tito's Communist state to well over \$1 billion. Representative Smith recalled that he had always expressed disapproval of aid to Tito; he had always feared the Communist dictator would turn on the United States. "It's time," remarked Smith, "that we look into this."

Members of Congress were aroused several weeks ago when Marshal Tito offered to equip a brigade for the Soviet puppet Government of Burma, now at odds with its neighbor Thailand which is hostile to Moscow and backed by the United States. (See HUMAN EVENTS, January 29 issue.)

Not Merely Gossip: Senator Knowland is scheduled to address the annual banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York on March 17. It is understood that Cardinal Spellman was partly instrumental in getting the California Senator to appear before this gathering. The Capital thinks that it is news that the great "war prelate" who strengthened the morale of the armed forces in World War II shows interest in Knowland, whose eloquent insistence on standing firm against Communism is in the headlines. It is news also that the Californian will appear in this traditionally important political "spot" on St. Patrick's Day. One observation here is that Knowland, renowned as the Majority Leader of his Party who voted against the "condemnation" resolution of Senator McCarthy last November, should prove popular with his audience. It would not be surprising if the Senator reminded his listeners that only Republicans voted against the "censure" resolution.

● It took place at one of the numerous social gatherings in the White House recently. "Assistant President" Sherman Adams found himself in spirited colloquy with Lesley Frost (daughter of Robert Frost, the poet), moving figure in the Foundation to Combat Communism. Miss Frost bluntly asked Adams, "Are you, as I hear, in favor of world government?" Adams looking uneasily at some of his aides nearby, murmured weakly, "No, that's an exaggeration. I'm interested in international cooperation." Miss Frost pushed on: "But I gather that President Eisenhower privately wants a world state, with the U.S. in it. How about that?" Adams, testily now, "I don't think that's true at all. The President wants to work for international cooperation," and turned away. But not before one of his staff was heard to mumble rebelliously, "Well, I'm for a world government and proud of it."

Labor Federation Merger: The decision of the AFofL and CIO to merge inspires some critical comments on Capitol Hill. As the result of the decision, it is pointed out, there looms on the horizon the greatest labor monopoly in our history. Unions are legally exempt at present from the anti-trust laws. If the Department of Justice anti-trust division can oppose the proposed merger of Bethlehem Steel and Youngstown Sheet and Tube, should not legislation be enacted to place Labor on the same footing as Business, under the anti-trust laws?

And Representative Carroll Kearns (R., Pa.) of the House Labor Committee, remarks that the result of the merger will be the creation of a "corporation" of about 15 million "stockholders," most of whom have no voice in decisions whether they can go on strike or continue to work. "Why should not such a

mammoth merged corporation be subject to the law as well as any other type of merger?" asks Representative Kearns.

Bricker Amendment: The results of last fall's elections seemed to doom the Bricker amendment. With a Democratic Congress and the Administration both opposed, it appeared unlikely the proposed amendment would get far in the congressional machinery.

But now the Ohio Senator has received an unexpected break. When Congress convened, Bricker promptly put the measure in the legislative hopper. It was then routed to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee whose membership had not been settled.

Announcement this week of appointment of members suggests that it will not only get more public hearings but is assured of being "reported out" favorably by this Subcommittee. The composition of the Committee includes three Democrats (Senators Kefauver of Tennessee, Hennings of Missouri and Daniel of Texas) and two Republicans (Senators Langer of North Dakota and Dirksen of Illinois). Daniel, Langer and Dirksen voted for the Bricker amendment in the last session of Congress and also lined up solidly for the George substitute measure after it became apparent that the Bricker version could not pass. This will give the Bricker bill an edge of 3-2 on the new Subcommittee.

In the last Congress Senator Bricker, hopeful of getting his amendment by the Senate, reluctantly weakened the draft which the American Bar Association preferred. The controversial "which clause", considered by eminent constitutional lawyers of the Bar Association as the best protection to the Constitution, was deleted. In the present bill, this clause in substance has been put back. Only the word "which" has been stricken, an omission which has no weakening effect whatsoever on the original provision. This time, we are told, Senator Bricker will not make any compromises and will insist *in toto* on the draft which three times was overwhelmingly approved by the Bar Association's House of Delegates.

Judge Harlan: The nomination of Judge John Marshall Harlan as Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court faces delay in confirmation. When the Senate Committee meets to consider the matter late this month, one aspect of the Harlan career will be brought up. That is the report — which has been going around — that he is for U.S. membership in a world government. HUMAN EVENTS has done some investigating and offers proof of the report. The Washington office of the Atlantic Union Committee informs us that Judge John Marshall Harlan has been on the Committee's National Advisory Council since 1952. The Committee advocates that the U.S. join in a common government with Canada, Britain, France and other nations, thereby surrendering our sovereignty. Atlantic Union's leaders are Clarence Streit and former Justice Roberts.

Education Front: The drive of the Federal-Aid-To-Education advocates is on with a vengeance, with the President's request for huge appropriations for such aid. The reasons for this demand for funds are embodied in some astronomical estimates of what is called "school needs." HUMAN EVENTS on January 15 pointed out how, in 1948, the New York State authorities checked on a requested program involving huge sums on "needed" buildings and repairs, found the "needs" exaggerated and settled down to a comparatively modest expenditure of money, and — with few exceptions — the local authorities easily shouldered the burdens.

Now, Indiana is doing some checking — and thinking. The *Indianapolis Star* recalls that in 1948, the Indiana State Teacher's Association declared that there was "clearly" shown a "need for 5,000 more classrooms by 1950 and another 2,000 by 1961-2." The Association predicted enrollment increases totaling 231,000 "in the next few years."

The *Star* states that this enrollment increase has not yet taken place and that by 1950 additional schoolrooms needed ran to less than 2,000, instead of 5,000. Indeed, remarks the *Star*, the 5,000 additional rooms needed has been only reached in the past year, four years later than predicted.

The thinking of the Hoosier paper, as a result of this experience, runs to skepticism of the Federal picture as presented here in Washington. "The implication," says the *Star*, "is clear that the statements of need and ability on which are based pleas for a Federal aid program are probably no more accurate

than were the New York figures in 1948. We are being told that the nation needs 720,000 classrooms to cost \$28,000,000,000 in the next five years and that '41 of 43 states included in this report did not have sufficient applicable resources obtainable under existing laws and practices to meet their current capital outlay needs.' Where are the foundation statistics for these impressive statements?"

Matusow Case: The uproar over the "former Communist" who told on the Communist Party, and now claims he lied about the C.P., can be interpreted only in the context of a well-orchestrated drive in the last year by "liberals" (following, not surprisingly, the *Daily Worker* line.) That drive has been to scuttle the Smith Act (which seeks to jail traitors) by discrediting the former Communists who provided evidence against Communist officials and fellow-travellers. This course is designed to keep the anti-Communists on the defensive (witness the McCarthy battle of the past year.) This line of attack, as directed against former Communists, reached its height several months ago, but then faltered.

Renewed now, it may not get far. For the public recalls that J. Edgar Hoover has backed the soundness of the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, whose evidence against her former comrades has stood up well. Also, "liberal" attacks have failed to shake former Communist Louis Budenz. As for Matusow, it is pointed out here in Washington that he was a very minor witness and his testimony was of importance only in one case — that of Clinton E. Jencks, a labor leader. Matusow appeared at one of the McCarthy group hearings. In the past week the Communist Party used an affidavit signed by Matusow in a legal move in favor of a new trial for the 13 convicted Communists. It is going to take more than Matusow — say observers here — to cast a shadow on the proved truth of charges such as Bentley, Chambers and Budenz have made.

Radio Front: John T. Flynn, author of *The Road Ahead* and other books, now is broadcasting through more than 100 stations on the Mutual Broadcasting System, across the country. The sponsor is America's Future, Inc., a non-profit, educational organization, 208 East 43rd Street, New York 17, N. Y. That organization informs us the Flynn program is available to all of the 460 Mutual stations and can be scheduled on a sustaining basis without cost. Radio listeners are urged to phone their Mutual stations, if the latter do not run the program.

ALABAMA WKUL Cullman WJJI Montgomery WTBF Troy	LOUISIANA KENT Shreveport	NEW YORK WMBO Auburn WKNY Kingston WICY Malone WOR New York WIRY Plattsburg	SOUTH DAKOTA KDSJ Deadwood KIHO Sioux Falls KWAT Watertown
ARKANSAS KTLO Mountain Home	MASSACHUSETTS WLLH Lowell-Lawrence WOCB West Yarmouth	NORTH CAROLINA WIST Charlotte WJNC Jacksonville WLOE Leaksville WHIT New Bern WGNI Wilmington	TENNESSEE WHBQ Memphis WMAK Nashville WHAL Shelbyville
FLORIDA WJHP Jacksonville WKWF Key West WLBE Leesburg WKAT Miami	MICHIGAN WBCK Battle Creek WIKB Iron River WSGW Saginaw-Bay City	NORTH DAKOTA KGCW Bismark-Mandan	TEXAS KIOX Bay City KLIF Dallas KTRE Lufkin KRIG Odessa KIUN Pecos KMAC San Antonio
GEORGIA WBBQ Augusta WMOG Brunswick WRGA Rome WTWA Thomson WLET Toccoa WAYX Waycross WSGC Elverton	MINNESOTA KAUS Austin KLIZ Brainerd KGDE Fergus Falls KWAD Wadena	OHIO WHKK Akron WATG Ashland WHK Cleveland WHKC Columbus WMAN Mansfield WMOA Marietta WHHH Warren Youngstown	UTAH KVNU Logan KALL Salt Lake City
IDAHO KFXD Nampa-Boise (Meridian)	MISSISSIPPI WROX Clarksdale WELO Tupelo WROB West Point WAZF Yazoo City	OKLAHOMA KWCO Chickasha KOCY Oklahoma City KAKC Tulsa	VIRGINIA WDFV Clifton Forge WNVA Norton
ILLINOIS WGN Chicago	MISSOURI KWOS Jefferson City	PENNSYLVANIA WESB Bradford WCMB Harrisburg WBPZ Lock Haven WPAM Pottsville WPXY Punxsutawney WBAX Wilkes-Barre	WASHINGTON KMO Tacoma
INDIANA WSAL Logansport	MONTANA KCAP Helena KXLO Lewiston KIYI Shelby	SOUTH CAROLINA WBSC Bennettsville WLAT Conway WAKE Greenville WKDK Newberry	WEST VIRGINIA WEPM Martinsburg WMON Montgomery WAJR Morgantown WBRW Welch WHAW Weston WTRF Wheeling (-Bellaire, O.) WBTH Williamson
IOWA KSTT Davenport KRIB Mason City	NEBRASKA KFGT Fremont KHAS Hastings KOLN Lincoln		WISCONSIN WLCC La Crosse WOMT Manitowoc WJMC Rice Lake WFHR Wisconsin Rapids
KANSAS KWBG Goodland KIND Independence KAKE Wichita	NEW MEXICO KABQ Albuquerque KSVP Artesia KFUN Las Vegas KRTR Raton		WYOMING KLUC Evanston
KENTUCKY WHIR Danville WSIP Paintsville			

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for \$3. Six months, \$6. One year, \$10. First class mail, one year, \$11.50, six months, \$6.75. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year \$13; foreign (regular mail) one year, \$12. Foreign airmail, \$18. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective. Bound annual volume with index, \$15.

FROM YALTA TO FORMOSA

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

THE TENTH anniversary of the Yalta Agreement between Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill, which came on February 11, 1955, should not be overlooked. Not that it is a date to inspire any feelings of pride or happiness. Yalta was one of the greatest moral and diplomatic defeats in the history of the United States. But the memory of defeats is sometimes more instructive than the recollection of victories, especially at a time when new defeats of the Yalta type cannot be ruled out.

Yalta has been a main target of the whitewash brigade of the Roosevelt Administration court historians and apologists. Desperate efforts have been made to prove either that Yalta was a regrettable military necessity or that the original pact would have been excellent if Stalin had only kept his word; that Roosevelt agreed to nothing that was dishonorable or contrary to United States national interests.

So it is worthwhile to recall those features of the Yalta pact which mark it as both a crime and a blunder and a sort of Pandora's Box, from which most of our international troubles in the postwar era have emerged.

First, Yalta signalized the abandonment of the free Poles, who had been fighting on our side during the war, the throwing over of their representative government and the acceptance of a made-in-Moscow puppet regime which has been governing Poland as a Soviet province ever since. At the same time, although the Atlantic Charter is hypocritically invoked in the pact several times, there were several flagrant and obvious violations of the Atlantic Charter assurances of self-determination for peoples.

The Soviet Union was allowed to incorporate, without a plebiscite, about half of Poland's pre-war territory and about one-third of the pre-war Polish population. Poland was given "compensation" in the annexation of considerable areas which were historically and ethnically German. This was emphatically a case when two wrongs did not make a right.

The Soviet Union was also assured a stranglehold on China's most industrialized area, Manchuria, and this was done without consulting or even informing the ally concerned, the Nationalist government of China. The United States in the Yalta Pact set the seal of its approval on the dismemberment of Germany and on the use of German slave labor as "reparations." The United States and Great Britain consented to be policemen

for the execution of a kind of fugitive slave law. They assumed the obligation to return to death or concentration camps Soviet citizens who were found in the Western zones of occupation.

NO AMOUNT OF APOLOGETICS on the part of Dean Acheson, the Alsop brothers and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., can obscure the plain historical fact that Yalta was a tremendous factor in the consolidation of the super-Genghis Khan empire which the Kremlin built up from the Baltic to the Pacific. Yalta made the United States and Great Britain accomplices — “unwitting handmaidens,” if one prefers the expression — in the underwriting of this empire.

News of the Yalta Agreement was a blow to anti-Communist forces of freedom everywhere, among the Poles and the other peoples of Eastern Europe, among the Germans, among the Chinese. If the United States and Great Britain were not prepared to stand up to Stalin, how could weaker countries, or resistance groups within these countries hope to do so?

It is sometimes argued by apologists for Yalta that Stalin received under this pact little which he had not taken, or could not have taken by force of arms. But this overlooks the vital point that American and British military sanction made the Soviet dictator's tremendous land grabs very much easier.

Even after Yalta, underground groups in Poland continued the struggle against Russian and Communist rule. They were only suppressed after thousands had been killed on both sides in the unequal struggle with the government troops and police. Had there been no acquiescence in Poland's mutilation and the subjugation by the Western powers, the underground struggle would, in all probability, have been much harder to put down.

Another argument of the Yalta apologists is that it was a great moral victory to persuade Stalin to sign his name to some promises about democracy, free elections, etc., all of which he broke without the slightest intention of keeping. In view of Stalin's long previous record of bad faith, this is something like hailing it as a sign of financial genius to accept without question at face value the checks of a notorious fraudulent bankrupt.

Was there an alternative to the Yalta sellout of Poland, of Nationalist China, of the ideals of Western civilization? Of course there was. The United States could have announced that it stood on the ground of the Atlantic Charter, that it did not propose to annex foreign territory itself and would not recognize as legitimate one square mile of Stalin's annexations beyond the pre-war frontiers of the Soviet Union. Behind this declaration would have stood the power of a country that was still fresh in the war, that had achieved the mightiest concentration of air and naval power in history, that would soon

detonate the atomic bomb. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was exhausted in manpower and resources, had sustained enormous casualties and was dependent on American lend-lease trucks, food and field telephones to keep its offensives rolling.

The chances are that Stalin would have bowed to such a firm and clearcut statement of purpose. And if he had proved intransigent, the showdown in 1945 would have been less costly and risky than a showdown in 1955, or in 1965.

YALTA WAS NOT an isolated lapse. It was a consequence as much as a cause, a consequence of the persistently-favored delusion of the Roosevelt Administration that, if Stalin was only flattered and appeased enough, he would become a cooperative do-gooder in a brave new world.

In the interest of this delusion American public opinion was systematically drugged by the agencies for molding public opinion during the war. And it must be recognized that some eminent commentators, columnists and magazine editors were pretty willing drug addicts.

As a result, it was only by stealthy, almost underground methods and in publications of limited circulation, like HUMAN EVENTS, that the less pleasant facts of Soviet behavior in newly annexed territory were brought to light. American public opinion at the time of the Yalta conference had been deliberately denied the facts on which it might have judged what a monstrous thing it was to hand over people to Communist rule or to send back Soviet refugees.

Few Americans at that time realized that the Soviet Government had murdered fifteen thousand Polish officer war prisoners in cold blood in the Katyn Forest and elsewhere (this atrocity was conveniently ascribed to the Nazis); that about a million and a quarter human beings had been deported from Eastern Poland under circumstances so cruel that about a quarter of them perished; or that similar atrocities were committed in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

I happened to be present at a small informal dinner in a representative medium-sized American city just after the news of Yalta was announced. One of those present was an Estonian woman who had escaped from that Baltic country before the Communists took over. Her husband, less fortunate, had been shot. She knew, and I knew, that Yalta amounted to ringing down the curtain on freedom in Eastern Europe for a long time.

But the other guests — not Communists or fellow-travellers, just average Americans — were enthusiastic over what they considered the happy news of agreement at Yalta. Had not Raymond Gram Swing assured them that “no more appropriate news could be conceived to celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln” and Senator Alben Barkley given

his blessing to "one of the most important steps ever taken to promote peace and happiness in the world"?

BY APPROPRIATE COINCIDENCE the tenth anniversary of Yalta comes at a time when tremendous pressure is being put on the United States to repeat the Yalta formula of giving the Communists everything they want in the Pacific. Again we are being called on to sacrifice a loyal fighting ally, Chiang Kai-shek, in pursuit of the will-of-the-wisp of placating and appeasing an implacable and unappeasable enemy in Peiping and in Moscow.

Have we learned the bitter unmistakable lesson of Yalta, that appeasement in international relations, like blackmail in personal relations, never pays off and never ends? In that case we will keep up our clear "No Trespassing" sign around Formosa and give the power-drunk dictators in Peiping the choice between backing down on their tall talk about "liberating" Formosa or taking on the United States in an air and naval war, in which there will be no privileged sanctuary, as in Manchuria during the Korean war. In this case we will win, whatever decision may be taken in Peiping, and will regain in Asia and in the world some of the prestige that was lost by the war fought with one hand tied behind our back in Korea and by the policy of shaking first a fist, then a finger, in Indochina.

But the decision to bring the United Nations, of unhappy memory for its ignoble role in Korea, into the picture as an agency for bringing about a cease-fire is full of ominous possibilities. Very few members of the United Nations are wholeheartedly committed, as we are, to keeping Formosa and the adjacent islands free from Communist domination.

We have had the spectacle of a distinguished British thinker, Bertrand Russell, going temporarily off his rocker and suggesting that 1955 may see the end of the human race, unless the fighting in Formosan waters is stopped. We can rely on Prime Minister Nehru of India, on the basis of his past performance in Korea, to serve up all sorts of 99% surrenders to Red China in the guise of acceptable "compromises."

There will be a Tower of Babel chorus of voices urging us to be "flexible," not to stick at a trifle like surrendering the offshore islands which are so essential for the defense of Formosa. Few if any voices will urge the Chinese Communists to be "flexible."

It is worth remembering that ten years ago we sacrificed a fighting loyal ally, Free Poland, in the vain hope of placating Stalin and winning a peace. Let us not imagine that we shall appease Mao Tse-tung and buy peace, in our time or for any long time, if we offer up Free China as a sacrifice in a Formosan Yalta.

Additional Copies of Section II (the article section): 6 for \$1; 10 for \$1.50; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10; 500 for \$15; 1,000 for \$25.

Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article (of which this section is an example). \$10 per year. Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for \$1.